

# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/589,636	06/07/2000	Tue Nguyen	SIM013	8595
23910	7590 09/21/2004		EXAMINER	
FLIESLER MEYER, LLP FOUR EMBARCADERO CENTER			KERNS, KEVIN P	
SUITE 400	INCADERO CENTER		ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER	
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111			1725	

DATE MAILED: 09/21/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/589,636	NGUYEN, TUE
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	Kevin P. Kerns	1725
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap	ppears on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPITHE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a report of the period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statution and the provided by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tin ply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) day d will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from te, cause the application to become ABANDONE	nely filed  s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. & 133).
Status		•
1) ■ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28.  2a) ■ This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) ■ This action for allowed closed in accordance with the practice under	is action is non-final. ance except for formal matters, pro	esecution as to the merits is
Disposition of Claims		
4)	awn from consideration.  /are rejected.  cted to.	
Application Papers		
9) The specification is objected to by the Examin		
10) The drawing(s) filed on <u>28 June 2004</u> is/are: a  Applicant may not request that any objection to the		-
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct		. ,
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the E		
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority document application from the International Bureat * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	ts have been received.  ts have been received in Application  prity documents have been receive  nu (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage
Attachment(s)  1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  Paper No(s)/Mail Date 6/28/04.	4)  Interview Summary ( Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5)  Notice of Informal Pa 6) Other:	(PTO-413) te atent Application (PTO-152)

### **DETAILED ACTION**

### Specification

1. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: on page 3, 1<sup>st</sup> line of the amended specification, "the" should be deleted before "use". Appropriate correction is required.

### Claim Objections

2. Claims 1 and 15 are objected to because of the following informalities: in claim 1, 6<sup>th</sup> line from the end of the claim, "adpated" should be changed to "adapted". In claim 15, 1<sup>st</sup> line, "collected" should be changed to "collect". Appropriate correction is required.

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 4. Claims 1, 2, 4-8, 15-17, 20, 22, and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schmitt et al. (US 6,099,649).

Schmitt et al. disclose a chemical vapor deposition trapping system for unreacted precursor conversion and effluent removal, in which the trapping system includes the

Art Unit: 1725

following structures (in order from upstream to downstream): a process chamber (14,521), a hot trap 16, a heater power supply 26 for heating the foreline 20, a vacuum pump 22 with associated heater 24 (alternatively, with pump 22 being self-heated in one embodiment), one or more cold traps (28,501,513) being downstream from the hot trap 16 in both embodiments, a burn box 30, and a plurality of valves (505,511,515,517,525) operable to isolate and/or divert flow through either, both, or none of the cold traps (abstract; column 1, lines 6-10; column 2, lines 11-25 and 53-63; column 4, lines 20-62; column 5, lines 57-67; column 6, lines 1-67; column 7, lines 1-42; and Figures 1 and 4-6). Although not specifically disclosed by Schmitt et al., one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the use of a burn box as another hot trap (being downstream from the vacuum pump of Figure 1), as well as the use of isolation valves between one or more of the other components and control of trap temperatures within the trapping system, would have been obvious for the purpose of achieving efficient trapping and recovery of waste materials for recycling, and subsequent repairing and/or replacing of one or more of the cold traps, the hot trap, the vacuum pump, or the process chamber, respectively (Schmitt et al.; abstract; column 2, lines 11-25; column 6, lines 1-67; and column 7, lines 1-42).

5. Claims 10-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schmitt et al. (US 6,099,649) in view of Kumada et al. (US 5,405,445).

Schmitt et al. disclose and/or suggest the elements of claim 1 above. Schmitt et al. do not specifically disclose the use of a bias voltage and a catalyst.

Art Unit: 1725

However, Kumada et al. disclose a vacuum extraction system for a chemical vapor deposition (CVD) reactor vessel with a trapping device, in which the CVD apparatus 12 includes a reactor vessel 14 having first and second electrodes (16,18) through which an RF bias voltage is applied to cause a discharge therebetween (at a desired value and/or polarity depending on the amount of deposition and material of the substrate), while the system includes a trapping device 28 having a perforated tube member 78 that supplies a gaseous oxidizing agent (catalyst) of oxygen, water etc., such that active species formed by the discharge are deposited as a thin film in controlled amounts on the substrate, and to form oxides of deposition components, including oxides of silicon and titanium (abstract; column 1, lines 9-16 and 67-68; column 2, lines 1-68; column 3, lines 16-68; column 4, lines 1-68; column 5, lines 1-39; and Figures 1 and 2).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the applicant's invention was made to modify the chemical vapor deposition trapping system for unreacted precursor conversion and effluent removal, as disclosed/suggested by Schmitt et al., by using the RF bias voltage and oxidizing agent catalyst, as taught by Kumada et al., in order to form active species via the RF discharge voltage for depositing as a thin film in controlled amounts on the substrate, and to form oxides of deposition components, including oxides of silicon and titanium, respectively (Kumada et al.; abstract; column 3, lines 25-49; column 4, lines 60-68; and column 5, lines 1-39).

Application/Control Number: 09/589,636

Art Unit: 1725

### Allowable Subject Matter

6. Claims 3, 9, 18, 19, 21, and 24 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

7. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: the prior art fails to teach or suggest high pressure chemical vapor trapping systems that include the trapping arrangements of independent claims 1 and 15, and further including first and second cold traps, with the second cold trap operatively connected with and positioned downstream of the first cold trap (dependent claims 3 and 18).

#### Terminal Disclaimer

8. The terminal disclaimer filed on September 3, 2004 disclaiming the terminal portion of any patent granted on this application which would extend beyond the expiration date of any patent granted on co-pending US Application Serial No. 09/589,633 has been reviewed and is accepted. The terminal disclaimer has been recorded.

## Response to Arguments

9. The examiner acknowledges the applicant's amendment filed with new drawings and an Information Disclosure Statement, all of which were received by the USPTO on

Page 5

Art Unit: 1725

June 28, 2004. The IDS has been considered, and an initialed copy has been enclosed with this Office Action. New objections to the specification and claims have been raised by the applicant's amendments (see paragraphs 1 and 2 above). The applicant's amendments/remarks overcome all prior art rejections based on Varrin, Jr. et al. (US 5,015,503). Although an improper terminal disclaimer was filed on August 11, 2004, the applicant's 2<sup>nd</sup> terminal disclaimer filed September 3, 2004 has been reviewed and accepted. The applicant has cancelled claim 14, while adding new claims 15-24. Claims 1-13 and 15-24 are currently under consideration in the application.

10. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-13 and 15-24 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

#### Conclusion

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dr. Kevin P. Kerns whose telephone number is (571) 272-1178. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8:00am-5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tom Dunn can be reached on (571) 272-1171. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Application/Control Number: 09/589,636

Art Unit: 1725

Page 7

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Kevin P. Kerns Kevin Kevns 9/18/04 Examiner Art Unit 1725

ΚΡΚ kpk September 18, 2004